

Even though the FCC's flawed process makes it impossible for me to support its action, I am deeply concerned about the situation in rural communities where many TV and radio stations are struggling.

The FCC cross-ownership provisions would enable a newspaper to more easily acquire a troubled and failing broadcast station in situations where it might not be cost efficient for another entity to purchase the station.

Newspapers have the business expertise, the financial stability, and the news-gathering resources to supplement local news and informational programming. If the FCC and Department of Justice have determined that a transfer of title would serve the public interest and would not present an unfair market advantage, newspapers should be permitted to use these strengths to serve their communities.

Although pre-June 2 newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership prohibitions provided for a waiver that would allow a newspaper to purchase a failing broadcast company, only four such waivers have been granted in the past 28 years.

Under the current cross-ownership provisions, the smallest broadcast markets would be protected from monopolies, and a limited cross-ownership rule will remain in effect in markets of between four and eight broadcast companies.

The FCC newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rules will benefit communities in Nevada. For this reason, I support the cross-ownership part of the FCC's action.

I hope the final outcome of this will be to drop the number of stations a company can own but allow the cross-ownership. This will not only stimulate competition but will allow rural America to have some of the programming that simply will not be available unless a newspaper and/or a TV station join together. This is the way it is all over America, not just Nevada.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 17, the bipartisan resolution offered by Senators DORGAN, LOTT, and others that would repeal rule changes recently adopted by the Federal Communications Commission that, if allowed to go into effect, could dramatically alter the shape of the American media landscape.

The foundation of our democracy is based on the free flow of information guaranteed by the first amendment. As the Supreme Court explained more than 50 years ago, the first amendment "rests on the assumption that the widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources is essential to the welfare of the people." Unfortunately, the FCC's recent changes to its broadcast media ownership rules call into question that agency's commitment to this fundamental principle.

On June 2 of this year, the FCC voted to significantly relax rules that protect

the American people from the ill-effects of concentrated media power. Already, in television and in print, large media conglomerates control an alarming amount of what Americans see, read, and hear. In fact, 75 percent of what Americans watch during prime time and 90 percent of the top 50 channels on cable are controlled by just 5 media companies.

Against this backdrop, the FCC's decision to allow greater concentration of ownership is clearly a step in the wrong direction. If allowed to go into effect, these rules will result in fewer creative outlets for independent television and content producers; higher ad rates for large and small businesses; fewer antagonistic sources of news and opinion; and less air time for community groups. In addition, there may be growing reluctance by local station operators to take on network executives in rejecting nationally produced programming that violates community standards.

Some Members contend that "[t]here should be reasoned debate on each of the rules" rather than disapproving the entire package. I fully agree that there should be reasoned debate on each of the rules. That is exactly what I, along with 14 other Senators, asked FCC Chairman Michael Powell to do—to give Americans the opportunity to review and comment on the specific rule changes before any final decision by the FCC. Our request was denied.

While recent action by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in staying the implementation of these new rules is an encouraging sign that these changes may not survive judicial scrutiny, we in Congress should not rely on court action. Instead, we must act decisively to protect the public interest and to rescind these recently adopted rules.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2754, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2754) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, while we are now on this energy-water appropriations bill, let me first thank my friend, Senator HARRY REID from Nevada, as the ranking member of this subcommittee, for the hard work he and his staff put into this bill. We have a great bill. The Senate will find that out in the next 2 or 3 days. I am hopeful there will only be a few amendments. We kind of know what they are. We do not intend to discuss them until those proponents come to the floor and offer them, but we know about them and we think we can have a serious debate Monday. I understand maybe we

can't vote on Monday. If we can, we will, and dispose of that serious nuclear amendment—antinuclear development amendment. If not, we would do it on Tuesday.

But I hope nobody intends to use this bill as a Christmas tree for authorizations. I can assure them they will meet great resistance from this Senator. This is not an authorization bill for electricity. That is somewhere else, another bill. It is in the conference. We have already voted. We will not consider that, and if we do, it will not matter because I will not bring back from conference any energy amendments that belong on the authorization bill, creating the policy for the energy future of our country.

With that, I move now to the business before the Senate.

Today the Senate is going to consider one of the 13 appropriations bills. It is a small one, but it is a very important one. We worked very hard this year to put together what we think is a fair bill under extremely difficult circumstances. This fiscal 2004 allocation to the subcommittee is \$27 billion, an amount that is only \$367 million over the President's request. This situation posed a daunting challenge to the subcommittee.

Let me put that in context. All of the Members here know the President's request dramatically cut water projects. The occupant of the Chair knows that—it cut water projects well below the current year level and left out many projects we had to do.

Furthermore, the President proposed to fund a portion of the Corps of Engineers budget, an amount of \$145 million, in a way the Congressional Budget Office says is not permissible. If it is not permissible and we did it, it would be subject to a point of order—even though the Congressional Budget Office gives the President credit for the mechanism in this scoring request.

Thus, we have included a provision that will make an additional \$145 million available to the Corps to spend on the enactment of the provision in authorizing legislation that is required under the rules of the Congressional Budget Office. We think that is the way to do it.

But for now, the long and the short of all of this is that the President's request was \$530 million below the current year level for water projects, and we only received an increase from the appropriations process of \$367 million.

There is nothing that Senators and House Members are more aware of than water projects in their home States. I do not know if they are as important as the Members think. But I only can tell you that if you are chairman of this committee, you cannot get by without Senators stuffing your pockets with the requests and sending them to your office, saying: Don't forget; don't forget. We have a pile of them. I didn't bring them to the floor. There are more than a few hundred.

The bill spreads the increased allocation generally as follows:

An additional \$233 million to the Corps water projects; an additional \$67 million to the Bureau of Reclamation water projects; an additional \$80 million to independent regional commissions which were badly cut in the President's request, such as the Denali Regional Commission of Alaska, the Appalachia Regional Commission, and the Delta Regional Commission; and we held the Department of Energy at just about the President's request level.

I believe—and I think Senator REID will agree with me—that this was the fairest way to distribute the very limited resources. It was the fairest in any sense of the word, and also in the sense of the word of what our Members expect of us and what they can expect of us in doing our job correctly.

The bill provides \$4.43 billion for the Corps of Engineers. That is \$233 million above the President's request but \$212 million below the current year's level. We have included no new construction projects and have focused our resources on restoring the cuts to existing construction projects.

For the Bureau of Reclamation and related activities, the bill provides \$990 million, which is \$67 million above the President's request but only \$17 million above the current year level.

For nuclear weapons activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration—known as NNSA—the bill provides \$6.47 billion, which is \$96 million more than the President's request and \$492 million over the current year level.

The budget increases are consistent with a major Defense Department initiative to restore our nuclear weapons complex.

Mr. President, I told you when we opened the bill that it was a small bill. But it has a lot in it. It pays for the National Nuclear Security Administration. That is the laboratories and the administration. Among its charges is making sure scientifically, with the science-based Stockpile Stewardship Program—meaning these laboratories have to engage in all kinds and varieties of science—that they tell us our weapons are valid without testing them.

For most of our adult life we tested them, so we had no doubt. Great scientists hooked them up and the great desert provided the test site. And we tested them. But we voted to quit it. We didn't vote to stop having nuclear weapons; we just voted not to test them.

Somebody has the responsibility when you stop testing them to be in a position of reporting to the Chief Executive and, thus, then to us whether the weapons are still valid. Some of them are 30 or 35 years old. I don't know whether they are 40 years old yet. But they are pretty old for nuclear weapons. So somebody has to do that. That is the work of the National Nuclear Security Administration and the laboratories, and this bill has to pay for that.

For nuclear nonproliferation activities, it is important that we understand this little bill funds \$1.34 billion, which is the same as the President's request, and \$171 million above the current level. The committee continues its leadership role in countering nuclear terrorism. The budget request, coupled with \$148 million added in last year's supplemental, gives a strong boost to this highly important program.

When we speak of terror in the world, we now have almost stopped talking about nuclear terrorism because we speak so much about biological terrorism and chemical terrorism. But we cannot forget that the granddaddy of all terrorist activities is a nuclear terrorist activity.

Nonproliferation is the effort of our Government to try to keep the things that people might use for nuclear weapons or to keep them out of the hands of those who might put them together and use them. That is a big job.

This is a little bill with a lot of money—\$1.34 billion for that effort. We have great laboratory people engaged in that.

Then there is the "Isn't good news provision." We have been paying to clean up energy sites for many years. These are the sites that remained from the cold-war era in the development of nuclear weapons and plutonium in various parts of America, such as the Savannah River area, areas in the west coast and Washington—environmental cleanup sites.

This bill provides an incredible amount of money—\$7.6 billion. But believe it or not, that is \$62 million below the President's request. For the first time in many years, it is less than the previous year—\$238 million less.

The subcommittee was not required to add huge additional amounts to maintain cleanup budgets around the country. This is an unknown—almost secret—success of this Department of Energy. They said they would do it when they took office, but they have been saying it as they took office in that Department for 12 years, that I am aware of, and each year it was more—not less.

We finally have a couple of projects—led by one in Colorado—which have timeframes for completion which is credible and near at hand. There are some that are going to go on for a long time. But at least since this money comes out of the defense of our country, the Defense Department might be hopeful that as they increase their defense dollars we will not have to suck away large amounts to pay for this cleanup, although I am not yet making that as a promise because there are a few of these sites for which we are not absolutely certain how long it will take and how much it will cost. But they have become extremely, extremely expensive sites with thousands of people employed.

The frustration level for a Senator such as me paying for it year after year

is very high. I didn't think the cleanup sites were supposed to be public works projects. I thought they were supposed to be cleanup sites.

But there is a lot of justification and a lot of reasoning, and we are not responsible for all of them. But some of them we have to fix, and we are trying.

Then there is a great issue in the State of my friend, HARRY REID, of Yucca Mountain. The project at Yucca causes the Senate to provide \$425 million for 2004 construction. That is \$166 million below the President's request, and \$32 million less than the current level. But this project will be a major point of contention in conference with the House, which has increased the project by \$180 million over the request.

This is a very important matter to many members of the subcommittee, each for various reasons, and it will require additional work as we move through the process.

For renewable energy research and development, believe it or not, we even found the money—\$459 million, which is \$15 million more than the President's request and \$40 million more than this year—for renewables.

The committee funds the President's new hydrogen technology initiative.

For nuclear energy research and development, the bill provides \$437 million, which is \$447 million above the President's request and \$63 million over a comparable current bill level. The Members know this is a great priority of mine as we continue to make investments. I believe it will eventually result in the construction of a new commercial power reactor, or more than one, in the United States. We will provide a total of \$35 million toward the development of a new reactor in Idaho that could produce both electricity and hydrogen. We are not alone in this goal and in this kind of project. Japan is on the way. Japan is substantially ahead in terms of a timeframe for hydrogen engines in automobiles. Yet it is not something that will happen quickly. It is a few years away even for them, like 10, and, who knows, more than that for us. But we had better get started since we know we are hugely dependent upon oil from foreign countries.

Basic research for the Department of Energy: \$3.36 billion, which is \$50 million above the President and \$88 million above this year. We talk about research. We had a big debate last night about research at the National Institutes of Health, a huge debate. We are researching the human body and the ways we might give health where the bodies are sick and find solutions to illnesses that besiege us. We are spending a huge amount of money in that field. I think the figure was well over the \$25 billion mark.

The other agency that does research, but in physics and other sciences, is the Department of Energy. We do not treat it right; we only have \$3.36 billion. That is \$88 million more than last year for all of their research.

The bill provides \$48.5 million for the Denali Commission, \$58 million for the Appalachian Regional Commission, and \$7 million for the Delta Regional Authority, an increase of \$5 million over the President's request and \$1 million below the current year level.

The bill also provides a total budget of \$619 million for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the same as the budget request and an increase of \$41 million over the current year level.

Given the overall constraints, we worked hard but were unfortunately limited to accommodating only the highest priority requests of Members where possible. This is going to be a difficult year, but I look forward to the recommendations of other Members.

Finally, the Senate should be fully aware that the committee reported bill includes a provision regarding the Middle Rio Grande River in New Mexico. The provision does two things. First it prohibits the use of outer-basin water for endangered species purposes. Second, it establishes how the Endangered Species Act will be complied with for this river and the affected fish. This is a very important provision that has the bipartisan support in the New Mexico delegation and at the state level.

Before I yield to the floor and my Ranking Member for his statement, I would like to thank him and his excellent staff for all the effort he has put forth in getting this bill put together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. I join with Senator DOMENICI in presenting this 2004 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. I am pleased with the bill Senator DOMENICI and I have produced. Our relationship extends all my time in the Senate on this committee. We have done this bill seven or eight cycles. We have worked together a long time and have worked well together.

This has proven to be a difficult bill this year given the very tight budget constraints within which we had to work. Effectively, Senator DOMENICI and I—I hate to use the word “effectively”—we have worked well together. We have \$367 million in new funding, which is hardly adequate to pay for the many needs in this bill.

We added the first \$300 million to the Corps of Engineers in the Bureau of Reclamation. I am pleased we added \$233 million above the budget for the Corps, but I note that we are \$212 million below what we enacted last year.

I realize with respect to staffs, they have done the best they could do with the limited resources. But we need to recognize that by underfunding the Corps of Engineers, we are seriously impacting how they accomplish the mission Congress laid out for them. Project schedules will continue to be lengthened, the maintenance backlog will grow, and solutions to water needs throughout the country will be delayed.

We must always remember, as many have said, wars in the future are not

going to be fought over land but over water. We have wars already taking place within the confines of our country dealing with water.

Senator DOMENICI and I believe over the long term we need to find additional resources for the Corps. The work they do for our Nation is too important to be underfunded in the manner they are underfunded.

Finally, \$67 million in funding above the President's request was added to regional commissions which were slashed in the President's budget request. While the funding for the Denali Commission, the Appalachian Regional Commission, and the Delta Regional Authority is far below what is required, we have been able to improve matters significantly. While we were able to restore current year funding to the Appalachian Regional Commission, I am disappointed we are unable to do more for the Delta Regional Authority. However, our funding constraints simply do not allow more funding to be restored at this point.

At some time there will be offered an emergency title fund for weather-related, nationwide problems, and that is what we have done while the bill is on the floor. I am prepared to muster every vote possible to support this critical emergency package. There was a debate yesterday that took place, but a very cursory glance would recognize this is much different from what was presented yesterday. We try to be fiscally prudent. We strive to be fiscally prudent. We were sent here to be responsive to the needs of the American people. Devastating floods, hurricanes, tornados, and fires have hit so many parts of the country this year, requiring a response from the Congress. I am glad we are going to do so. We will have bipartisan support for this emergency request.

As for fiscal year 2004 before the Senate, I reiterate, as either Senator DOMENICI or I do every year at this time, we have produced a bipartisan bill that addresses the needs of the Nation and accommodates many of the desires of our Members. We cannot give everyone everything they need. That is an understatement. We do the best we can. Our subcommittee has always been known as one of the most collegial on the Hill. Our staffs have performed this way this year in super fashion. I extend to Senator DOMENICI my appreciation for his leadership in helping produce this bill.

Additionally, I think it is useful to let everyone know there have been certain items deferred for consideration when we go to conference—that is, with one exception—the same items we defer each year until we know what our final resources will be. We cannot do that until we complete our conference. So there are no new construction starts or new environment infrastructure projects for the Corps or Bureau and no university or hospital marks within the DOE's Office of Science and no geographically specific renewable

energy earmarks. It is my expectation, as every year, that we will emerge with Members' projects in each of the accounts.

In my view, we will accomplish three very important objectives with this legislation. No. 1, we have been able to restore many of the ridiculous cuts made by the administration to the Corps and Bureau. This President, this administration, is not the only one that has made these ridiculous cuts, but that is not the way it is. For reasons I do not fully understand, every administration does such a terrible job of understanding the importance of the Corps of Engineers. Each year, we get a budget from a President that tremendously underfunds these programs.

It reminds me of when I was chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee. Every year, we got a request from the President that did not do anything for the Guard and Reserve—nothing. I don't know what this country would have done if we had sent the bill back they gave us. Every year, the Congress bails out the administration on projects, programs relating to the National Guard and Reserve programs. That is what this reminds me of. I don't know what the country would do if we sent the administration back the bill they gave us. But as usual, we don't have the resources to do more.

We have a construction backlog with the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of \$40 billion, but we have found enough resources to prevent the problem from becoming much worse. The chronic underfunding of the Corps of Engineers prevents it from establishing the critical flood control and navigation infrastructure of this Nation.

In the meantime, rather than me going into a lot of detail, suffice it to say that I believe this administration is doing the American taxpayer a tremendous disservice by sending woefully inadequate budget requests to Capitol Hill. In fact, I believe they are putting our economy at risk and putting people's lives at risk.

No. 2, in this bill we have fully funded the National Nuclear Security Administration, the organization charged with keeping our nuclear weapons stockpile safe, secure, and reliable, and with securing and safeguarding fissile material abroad, particularly in Russia.

At a time when our Nation has never been more concerned about homeland security, these programs are more critical than ever.

As I mentioned earlier, we are going to send an amendment to the desk at a subsequent time that will provide, on an emergency basis, \$125 million in Corps of Engineers funding to mitigate weather-related damages. Acts of God is the reason we are offering this emergency amendment. There may be a few who oppose an emergency designation on this portion of the bill, but this funding is absolutely critical to the

parts of our country that have been devastated by floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and fires this year.

Senator DOMENICI did a fine job of describing the bill, so I will not take up everyone's time by repeating it. However, before we close here today, I want to take a moment to thank the staffs for all their hard work.

This bill has never had the resources needed to do what our Members would like us to do. However, the staffs have always done the very best they could with what we had.

Senator DOMENICI has always been well served by his now-former staff director, Clay Sell. Tammy Perrin and Erin McHale have also done a very good job for the majority staff.

Clay left the committee at the end of July to become a Special Assistant to President Bush for Economic Affairs. And I don't think it is appropriate to blame Clay for the just-announced deficits that we have. But I do say, on a serious note, he is a fine man, and the President is so fortunate to have someone of Clay's stature working for him.

As I have indicated, he has been great to work with. He has been a tremendous asset to Chairman DOMENICI. And my staff and I have nothing but fine things to say about him and the rest of Senator DOMENICI's staff.

I look forward to working with Senator DOMENICI's former Energy and Water staff director, Alex Flint, who is now the chief of staff in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, of which Senator DOMENICI is the chairman. Alex Flint is therefore working here on this bill as the staff director of the Natural Resources Committee, but also helping maneuver this bill through the Congress. And he can do that because he has had previous experience being the staff director for Senator DOMENICI.

Alex Flint is a fine man. He is of the same caliber as Clay. Senator DOMENICI has been served extremely well by these two fine men.

On my staff, Madam President, I thank Roger Cockrell. It was very difficult to do, but Roger agreed to leave his lifetime job, really, with the Corps of Engineers and come to work for the Senate, the Appropriations Committee. What a wonderful asset he has been to our committee.

Senator BYRD was elated we were able to work this out so that he came here. There is nobody in the Congress that knows more about the Corps of Engineers projects than Roger Cockrell. So I publicly thank him for making this very dramatic change in his personal life, leaving the career that he has had. And I am sure they are disappointed, the people at the Corps, but we in the Senate are elated he has decided to join us on a permanent basis. He does a wonderful job of handling our water issues.

There are a handful of Senators who are interested in the NNSA and other DOE issues, but every Member has an interest in the Corps of Engineers and/

or Bureau of Reclamation projects. Those projects are the engine that drives this bill, and Roger does a wonderful job of working through literally thousands of requests.

I also thank Nancy Olkewicz, who returned to the subcommittee to handle renewable energy, nuclear energy, the Office of Science, and several other non-Defense Department of Energy accounts this year after having worked for the full committee for a number of years.

Senator BYRD has spoken highly of Nancy. And I am very happy that she has been willing to come here and work with me on this bill, and also for Senator DURBIN on the legislative branch bill.

Finally, I want to say a word about my staff director, Drew Willison. Drew is one of those people who came to the Senate as a fellow from a Government agency. This agency was the Environmental Protection Agency. He worked with me, and he worked in the areas that he was not familiar with, but it didn't matter; he was tremendous. The first year he came to work for me, we had a highway bill. I had been on the Environment and Public Works Committee since I came to the Senate, and he was the first person who was able to impart to me enough information that I fully understood what I was doing.

As a result of that, I recognized talent when I saw it, and I worked with him to get him to leave the Environmental Protection Agency. He has had a very busy time working with me. He has graduated from law school while working with me, going to night school, which is very hard. He went to my alma mater, George Washington School of Law.

In short, let me just say that Drew Willison is a valuable asset to not only me but to our country.

And let me say to Senator DOMENICI, I appreciate many things about Senator DOMENICI, but most of all his friendship. He is a proud Republican. I am a proud Democrat. But first of all, we are proud Americans.

He does a tremendous job of representing the State of New Mexico. I have been with him to New Mexico. I have been to New Mexico without him. He is a person who serves that State very well.

As I have indicated, I thank Senator DOMENICI very much for our many years of working on this committee. I heard Senator SPECTER talk about he and Senator HARKIN having a seamless transition when things change in the Senate, but so do we. Under the circumstances we have had this year, it has been extremely difficult. I am happy to work with him and lock arms and do what we can to push through this most important piece of legislation.

Every dollar we have in this bill is designated. We don't have set-asides in this bill. Senator DOMENICI and I and our staffs work together to try to come up with a fair bill. These dollar

amounts in this bill are not—no one dictates to us what we do. We have to decide what is best for the country. We are not always right, but we really try to do what is right for the country.

I also thank Chairman STEVENS and Senator BYRD, who is also the former Democratic leader, for their steadfast support for the work that DOMENICI and REID do. I have never had either one of these people come to me and say: How could you have done this? It is the wrong thing you have done for the committee. It is quite the opposite. They come to us and say: How can we help?

So they are great to work with, these two men. The President pro tempore of the Senate is Senator STEVENS, who is the successor of the President pro tempore when we were in control, Senator BYRD.

These two very wise men have very tough choices to make, but I have great respect for the work they do, which has only been amplified by the way they worked with us on this bill.

So I look forward to debate on this bill starting next week. Senator DOMENICI and I are disappointed we are not going to have votes on Monday. But, as some know, a terrible tragedy occurred in the Senate family. The son of Senator GORDON SMITH, a wonderful human being, was taken in death this past Wednesday night. So as a result of that, there will be no Senate votes on Monday. The Senate will be in session on Monday, but out of respect for Senator SMITH, there will be no votes.

Senator DOMENICI and I have asked, and we have received word that Senator FEINSTEIN will offer her amendment, which will be cosponsored by Senator KENNEDY. They can be here at 2:30. We will see if the leader can agree that we can have them debate this matter and set it up for a vote Tuesday, at the discretion of the majority leader. I look forward to the debate.

As Senator DOMENICI said, we hope people understand this bill is not a perfect bill. It is the best we have done. If somebody has a problem, their staff should get ahold of our staff. We feel we have bipartisan support, and we have pretty much accomplished what we have set forth in the bill. The matter Senator FEINSTEIN will debate is something that, as far as we know, is the only real contentious issue on the bill, and that relates to some of the nuclear money in this bill. Other than that, I think we should have a fairly easy time moving this most important bill through the Senate. We look forward to conference, which, again, will not be easy. We have our position and we will do our best to protect the position of the Senate in conference with the House.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank Senator REID for his kind remarks. I think he knows that for each and every comment he made, I have

nothing but reciprocal feelings toward him. I thank him for his hard work and for working with me to get this good bill.

There are two things in this bill that are always misunderstood, and administration after administration makes it difficult. One is the Corps of Engineers. It is kind of amazing, whenever we get in trouble and we want somebody to build something for us someplace overseas, the Corps of Engineers is asked to supervise it and manage it and hire the people and the contractors—whether it is in Saudi Arabia or Iraq. And then at home, every President cuts the Corps of Engineers and leaves us in a position where we cannot sustain those numbers. So we have a bill that gets more difficult all the time.

This year, the President didn't do as badly; nonetheless, the same sequence was followed. We are trying to fix it somewhat. It has put us in the position where we cannot quite do it. We will be talking with other people in the Senate about some very serious emergency matters, which are not covered here, that we might very much have the Senate consider putting in this bill.

Second, people don't know we run three giant nuclear laboratories. That means we have to keep the best scientists in the world and their families living in the area, especially Los Alamos, which is a city built only for nuclear. That means we have to modernize because scientists are living in modern times. They want to work in modern facilities, not 50-year-old buildings. We are in the process of modernizing the workplace in Los Alamos in particular. Some don't understand that that is a must. We have to spend money to do it. In addition, as part of maintaining a rigorous core of nuclear weapons, there are certain scientific activities these laboratories have to do, so they are always on the cutting edge in terms of keeping these the most safe weapons. That means they have to do research—the most cutting-edge kind. You cannot have scientists at Sandia Laboratory or Los Alamos researching in depth a new science called nanoscience in shacks or in 50-year-old buildings. We are in the process of rebuilding modern facilities for this kind of science. We are going to bring companies and individuals to work with these great scientists as this new field of nanoscience is developed.

The same is true with micro-engineering, which is another incredible field. We have to do that, too. They need to use some micro-engineering aspects in replacing parts of nuclear weapons, to keep them safe. So we have to have facilities. We are in the process of building facilities—the greatest in the world—to take micro-engineering and develop it.

Microengineering, to put it in a simple way, is a wafer we use now for computers. The wafer we are talking about in microengineering contains on it thousands of machines, or engines. These little machines can be formu-

lated to work, one with the other, on a wafer. When you see it with a magnifying glass, you say what in the world is next for humankind, and what are they going to do with these? Nobody knows yet, but it will be part of the next generation. Perhaps medical science will use them. Perhaps it will be injected into the human body and these little machines will go to work and do things in the body, or for the body, such as clean out parts around the heart by just eating them up. We don't know. But those are things that are in these laboratories. We get excited when we hear and see them.

So when we fund these buildings, we are funding something great for our country. People don't believe us and they think maybe we should not be doing some of it, but we have been generally prevailing. The Senate has been saying let's do it, let's keep on.

Madam President, we are finished for the evening. We have nothing else to do, and we have no indication that anybody else wants to do anything. From my standpoint, I am going to finish now.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TELLING US THE TRUTH

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, September 11, 2001, was a day of infamy that will rank down with the very worst, most cowardly and vile actions ever taken against this Nation or any other nation on this planet, a sneak attack, murdering thousands—innocent children, women, and men—with no provocation, no forewarning, with no justification or rational reason, just the demented ravings and rantings of a fanatic who has perverted the principal teachings of his professed faith, of its greatest prophet, Mohammad. He twisted Mohammad's words into support for wars, with himself to play God and decide who deserved mercy and who did not.

Innocent civilians died in the United States as a result of that fanaticism. His soldiers died on September 11. And he is off somewhere hiding in a cave.

Ten Minnesotans or Minnesota natives lost their lives in the attacks

that terrible day: Gordon Aamoth, Jr., whose parents are good friends of my parents, an investment banker with offices on the 104th floor of the World Trade Center; as did Ann Nelson, a bond trader. Others were killed at work at the Pentagon: Captain Charles Burlingame, III, was the pilot of the hijacked American airlines plane which struck the World Trade Center. Tom Burnet was a passenger on United Airlines Flight 93, and one who led the counterattack against the hijackers on that plane. Tom and the other American heroes could not save themselves, but they may have saved us, as that plane's target was reportedly this very Capitol in which I stand with you today—alive, all of us, thanks, possibly, to Tom Burnet and the other American heroes.

These were good, hard-working Minnesotans, good, hard-working American citizens, who had the terrible misfortune to be living their lives in the wrong places on that day, September 11, 2001. They have been forever taken away from their families and friends, from their lives. So to those families and friends I express my very deepest condolences.

I remember leaving the Russell Senate Office Building that morning, going over to a hotel just a couple of blocks away from the Capitol where I was residing at the time, and I was asked by the general manager if I wanted to go up on the roof of the hotel, which I did, about 10:30 in the morning. The sky was totally clear except for a dark plume of cloud coming up from the Pentagon. There was no air traffic in the sky, no planes going in and out of National Airport, no helicopters, as is usually the case, going across the river.

All was quiet there until suddenly this one F-16 fighter plane came streaking down The Mall, seemingly just a few hundred feet right over the top of the Capitol. I thought to myself, I just never imagined in my worst nightmares I would ever see a day where a U.S. fighter jet was flying over our Capitol to defend it from whatever foreign enemy was attacking us. I pray to God I will never, ever see it again—never again.

George W. Bush became our President that week. He hadn't been elected our President, not in the traditional way of a democracy, by getting the most votes in the election, but that week he became our President. He rose magnificently to the enormous challenges and burdens which a President of the United States must bear, and must often bear alone, for all the rest of us. President Bush did that and he did it well, very well. He gained the good will of our entire Nation, and our Nation gained the good will of almost the entire world.

What priceless silver linings there were for all of us who survived those dark, terrible, black clouds which engulfed us on that terrible day. What opportunities those 10 Minnesotans and